1

2

3

4 5 6

8 9

7

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On October 2, 2007, Border Patrol Agent Quillin was patrolling the area of Rattlesnake Ridge south of Old Highway 80, approximately 20 miles east of the Tecate Port of Entry and approximately 2 miles north of the international border. This area is commonly used by illegal aliens to further their entry into the United States. At approximately 8:00 a.m., Agent Quillin responded to a seismic intrusion device where he observed fresh footprints for a group of people. He followed the prints when he encountered a group of six people, one of whom was the Defendant, Felix Mojica-Peralta.

Agent Quillin questioned each person about their citizenship and immigration status. Each person, including the Defendant, stated that they were Mexican citizens with no documents allowing them to enter the United States. All individuals were transported to the Campo Border Patrol Station for further processing.

All six individuals were processed at the station. Record checks revealed that Defendant had a criminal history including a conviction for PC §261, Rape, from Fresno, California. Agents were processing many people and did not review Defendant's records until that afternoon. At approximately 3:20 p.m. that same day, Agent Plasencia along with Agent Lopez advised Defendant that his administrative rights no longer applied and read Defendant his Miranda rights. Defendant acknowledged his Miranda rights and agreed to make a statement. He said that he was a Mexican citizen who knowingly entered the United States illegally by climbing over the boundary fence earlier that morning. He stated he was enroute to Fresno, California. He admitted he had no documents to enter the United States. He admitted that his criminal and immigration history was in fact his. The interview was electronically recorded.

II

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Discovery Should Not Be Compelled

The Defendant's prior counsel has previously filed this exact motion and it was denied by the Court.

2

07CR2984-BTM

To date, the Government has delivered 55 pages of discovery and 1 DVD. The Government recognizes and acknowledges its obligation pursuant to <u>Brady v. Maryland</u>, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), the Jencks Act, and Rules 12 and 16 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. The Government has complied and will continue to comply with its discovery obligations going forward. To date, the Government has received no reciprocal discovery.

As to exculpatory information, the United States is aware of its obligations under <u>Brady v. Maryland</u>, 373 U.S. 83 (1963) and <u>Giglio v. United States</u>, 405 U.S. 150 (1972) and will comply. The United States will also produce any evidence of bias/motive, impeachment or criminal investigation of any of its witnesses of which it becomes aware. An inquiry pursuant to <u>United States v. Henthorn</u>, 931 F.2d 29 (9th Cir. 1991) will also be conducted.

The United States will provide a list of witnesses in its trial memorandum. The grand jury transcript of any person who will testify at trial will also be produced.

The United States has provided information within its possession or control pertaining to the prior criminal history of Defendant. If the Government intends to offer any evidence under Rule 404(b) of the Federal Rules of Evidence, it will provide notice promptly to the Defendant.

The United States will produce any reports of experts that it intends to use in its case-in-chief at trial or such reports as may be material to the preparation of the defense. The Government also invited defense counsel to make an appointment with Government counsel to view the A file if he so chooses.

In view of the above-stated position of the United States concerning discovery, it is respectfully requested that no orders compelling specific discovery by the United States be made at this time. Further, the Government requests that defense counsel specify what discovery he is lacking, if any.

B. Leave to File Further Motions

The Government does not oppose Defendant's request to file further motions if based on newly produced discovery. Give the fact that no new discovery has been produced because there is no new discovery, the motion should be denied.

07CR2984-BTM

	Case 3:07-cr-02984-BTM Document 17 Filed 02/07/2008 Page 4 of 5
1	III
2	CONCLUSION
3	For the foregoing reasons, the Government respectfully requests that Defendant's motions be
4	denied.
5	DATED: February 7, 2008
6	Respectfully submitted,
7	KAREN P. HEWITT United States Attorney
8	
9	/s/ Alessandra P. Serano
10	ALESSANDRA P. SERANO Assistant U.S. Attorney
11	
12	
13	
14	
15 16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	4 07CR2984-BTM

	Case 3:07-cr-02984-BTM Document 17 Filed 02/07/2008 Page 5 of 5
1	
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) Case No. 07CR2984-BTM
5	Plaintiff,
6	v.) CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
7	FELIX MOJICA-PERALTA,
8	Defendant.
9	IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED THAT:
10	I, ALESSANDRA P. SERANO, am a citizen of the United States and am at least eighteen years
11	of age. My business address is 880 Front Street, Room 6293, San Diego, California 92101-8893.
12	I am not a party to the above-entitled action. I have caused service of Government's Response and Opposition to Defendant's Motions to Compel Discovery and Grant Leave to File Further Motions
13	and the Government's Motions for Reciprocal Discovery and Fingerprint Exemplars, on the following parties by electronically filing the foregoing with the Clerk of the District Court using its ECF System,
14	which electronically notifies them.
15	Christian de Olivas, Esq.
16 17	Email: christian@deolivaslaw.com
18	I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.
19	Executed on February 7, 2008
20	s/Alessandra P. Serano ALESSANDRA P. SERANO
21	ALESSANDRA F. SERANO
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

5

07CR2984-BTM